

REMARKS

The Office Action of 03/23/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 and 7-9 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter, which indication is appreciatively acknowledged..

Claim 1 was rejected as being anticipated by Matsumoto. Claim 2 was rejected as being unpatentable over Matsumoto in view of Shkap. These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration respectfully requested.

The invention of claim 1 differs from Matsumoto, among other respects, in that the pseudo latch circuit provides a differential output signal substantially equal with the feed-forward input signal, the feed-forward input signal in turn being substantially equal with the differential analog signal. Hence, the output signal of the pseudo latch circuit is an analog output signal, not a logic signal. Note in particular page 3, lines 16-24 of the present specification:

Cross coupling transistor pair i.e. a drain of a transistor is coupled to a gate of the other transistor and reciprocally determines a positive feedback in the pseudo latch circuit. Similarly as shown in previous relations 1-4, a current through the common drain transistor determined the currents through the second transistor pair. The current is chosen such that the overall amplification of the stage is substantially 1. Hence, the pseudo latch circuit *does not commute as a standard latch circuit* in which a drain of the transistor pair has a high voltage and the other drain has a low voltage and reciprocally and when the current through the transistor pair has substantially larger values. Hence, the pseudo latch circuit provides a signal substantially equal with the input signal.

In Matsumoto, on the other hand, the latch circuit does commute as described at col. 2, lines 22-38. Hence, the output signals of the latch circuit are logic outputs and are not equal to an analog differential input signal.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-9 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 07/18/2007